REMARKS

This application contains claims 1-54, all of which were rejected in the present Official Action. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the remarks presented below.

Claims 1-12, 14-36 and 38-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Hunt et al. (U.S. Patent 6,496,855). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites a method for privacy management with respect to a linked collection of interactive resources provided by an enterprise, wherein the enterprise assigns non-uniform privacy policies to at least some of the resources. A user accessing a given resource is provided with the respective privacy policy for that resource and exchanges information associated with the resource subject to the provided privacy policy. As noted in the specification, this method permits variable privacy policies to be set and enforced across an entire enterprise (page. 4, lines 2-14).

Hunt describes a Web site registration proxy system, in which a registration agent site serves as an intermediary between an Internet user and other sites. The agent allows users to register with new sites automatically and to move between registered sites via a single interface (abstract). A registration processing system is responsible for submitting user data to new sites, and includes the functionality of identifying and resolving conflicts between the user's privacy preferences and the site's policies (col. 5, lines 34-45). For this purpose, the registration processing system uses a registration profile database that includes site data privacy policies (col. 6, lines 8-14) and a user profile database that includes privacy preferences data which describe the policies the user would like a site to have if the user data is to be given to the site (col. 6, lines 44-56).

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner provided no rationale other than to state that the claim "is taught in '855 col. 2, lines 31-65." The only mention of the subject of privacy in the cited passage is in lines 61-65: "Preferably, the method includes the step of accepting user inputs which define a privacy policy in relation to the user's personal data which describes the extent to which the personal data is to be released for the purpose of submitting a registration application." This passage states no more than the standard definition and use of privacy policies, in this case in the context of Hunt's registration agent. It contains no teaching or suggestion of assigning non-uniform privacy policies to

- 2 -

resources of a given enterprise as required by claim 1, nor is such a teaching or suggestion to be found anywhere else in Hunt.

In this regard, Applicant begs to call the Examiner's attention to the conditions for rejections for anticipation set forth in MPEP 2131:

> TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California* ,814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)... "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co* ., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant respectfully submits that Hunt fails to set forth each and every element of claim 1, either expressly or inherently, as required for a novelty rejection. Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Hunt. In view of the patentability of claim 1, claims 2-12, 14 and 15, which depend from claim 1, are believed to be patentable, as well.

Independent claim 16 recites a method for privacy management in which a body of information is arranged in a hierarchy of nodes. Respective privacy rules are assigned to each of at least some of the nodes. The privacy policy for each of the nodes is then set to comprise the privacy rules assigned to that node combined with the privacy policy of its parent node.

The Examiner's grounds of rejection of claim 16 were also not detailed, but stated only: "taught in '855 col. 7, lines 52-65." The cited passage refers to grouping of user information into different categories, and states that "the user chooses an information policy, which tells the registration agent site 10 when and to whom the information in that category can be given out." There is no mention in this passage, or anywhere else in Hunt, of any sort of hierarchical node structure or, specifically, of determination of privacy policies at different nodes based on a hierarchy of privacy rules.

Thus, again Applicant respectfully submits that Hunt fails to set forth each and every element of claim 16, either expressly or inherently. Claim 16 is therefore believed to be patentable over Hunt, as are claims 17 and 18, which depend from claim 1.

Independent claim 19 recites a method for privacy management with respect to a linked collection of interactive resources provided by an enterprise. The enterprise receives information from users who access the resources subject to privacy policies associated with the resources. When an application then submits a request to use the information received from the users, the application is queried to determine its compliance with the privacy policies subject to which the requested information was received before providing the information to the application.

The grounds of rejection of claim 19 were that the first two steps of the claimed method are "disclosed in '855 col. 2, lines 31-65," and the remaining steps are "taught in '855 col. 5, lines 37-50." The former passage, which was also cited in the rejection of claim 1, includes the step of "accepting user inputs which define a privacy policy in relation to the user's personal data..." (col. 2, lines 61-63). In other words, the passage refers to the <u>user's personal privacy preferences</u>. The initial steps in claim 1, on the other hand, refer explicitly to associating privacy policies with a "linked collection of interactive resources" belonging to an enterprise, i.e., <u>enterprise privacy policies, subject to which the user may submit information to the enterprise.</u>

This latter passage describes, *inter alia*, "identifying and resolving conflicts between the user's privacy preferences and the site's policies" (lines 44-45). It makes no mention of "<u>intercepting a request</u> from an application" and then "<u>querying the application</u> to determine its <u>compliance with the [enterprise] privacy policies.</u>" It is not sufficient grounds for rejection of claim 19 that Hunt deals with the same general area of privacy policies. As noted above, MPEP states clearly that "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the... claim."

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of claim 19 is neither taught nor suggested in the cited art. Claim 19 is therefore believed to be patentable, as are claims 20-25, which depend from claim 19.

Claims 26-36 and 38-54 recite apparatus and computer software products that operate on principles similar to the methods of claims 1-12 and 14-25. These claims were rejected on identical grounds to the corresponding method claims. Thus, for the reasons explained above with respect to claims 1, 16 and 19, claims 26-36 and 38-54 are believed to be patentable over the cited art.

Claims 13 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hunt in view of Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent 6,581,059). Barrett describes a structured and accessible information repository for providing access to personal information, subject to personal preferences regarding conditions of use of the information. Barrett fails, however, to teach or suggest the elements of the claims in the present patent application that were shown above to be absent from Hunt. Therefore, claims 13 and 37 are believed to be patentable.

In addition to claims 13 and 37, Applicant believes that the dependent claims in this application recite patentable subject matter. In view of the patentability of the independent claims, however, and in the interest of brevity, Applicant will not argue the specific patentability of the dependent claims at this point.

Applicant believes the remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

December 28, 2004

S. Peter Ludwig
Reg. No. 25,351
Attorney for Applicants

DARBY & DARBY, P.C.
805 Third Avenue
New York, NY 10022
212-527-7700